PD-1348-17 COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS AUSTIN, TEXAS Transmitted 7/5/2018 10:55 AM Accepted 7/5/2018 11:15 AM DEANA WILLIAMSON

NO. PD-1348-17

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS/5/2018 DEANA WILLIAMSON, CLERK

LAURO EDUARDO RUIZ,

\$ TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL \$ APPEALS

v. \$ \$

STATE OF TEXAS, \$ AUSTIN, TEXAS \$ PD-1348-17

MOTION TO ALLOW FILING OF REPLY BRIEF

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS IN THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS CAUSE NUMBER 04-16-00226-CR

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, LAURO EDUARDO RUIZ, by and through his undersigned attorney, and respectfully requests that this Honorable Court allow him to file a reply to the State's brief pursuant to Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 70.4. Mr. Ruiz would show the following in support of said motion:

Mr. Ruiz filed his brief on May 14, 2018. The State of Texas filed their brief on June 29, 2018. This is Ruiz' first request to file a reply brief.

II.

The present case imparts an intersection of privacy rights in an increasingly digital era with the social norms of a society grappling with identifying the proper boundaries of our modern, interconnected cultural network. Unsurprisingly, cases sharing similar thematic concerns have jettisoned to the forefront of recent American political discourse.¹ As this Court's ruling is expected to have far reaching implications, Appellee believes the Court would benefit from additional briefing on the matter.

III.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Appellee respectfully requests that this Court grant Appellee permission to submit additional briefing in the present case pursuant to rule 70.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.

¹ See e.g. Carpenter v. United States, 585 U.S. ____ (2018) (in this 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court wrestled with privacy interests in historical cell tower information in a closely fought opinion which produced four forceful individual dissents), Ellen Nakashima, Apple Vows to Resist FBI Demand to Crack IPhone Linked to San Bernardino Attacks, (February 17, 2016), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-wants-apple-to-help-unlock-iphone-used-by-san-bernardino-shooter/2016/02/16/69b903ee-d4d9-11e5-9823-

02b905009f99_story.html?utm_term=.2c20551bc45f (chronicling the herculean legal confrontation between Apple and the FBI in relation to the unlocking of an iPhone linked to the 2015 San Bernardino terrorist attack).

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF SHAWN C. BROWN

/S/ ADRIAN FLORES

ADRIAN FLORES
State Bar No. 24078506
SHAWN C. BROWN
State Bar No. 24003613
540 S. St. Mary's St.
San Antonio, Texas 78205
Telephone No. 210/224-8200
Telecopier No. 210/224-8214
Shawn@shawnbrownlaw.com
adrian@shawnbrownlaw.com

LAW OFFICES OF ALAN BROWN

/S/ Alex J.Scharff

ALEX J. SCHARFF State Bar No. 17727350 222 Main Plaza

San Antonio, Texas 78205 Telephone No. 210/227-5103 Telecopier No. 210/225-2481 alex@lawofficesofalanbrown.com ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the following Brief for Appellant was delivered to the Bexar County District Attorney's via E-file on this 5 day of July, 2018.

/S/ ADRIAN FLORES

NO. PD-1348-17
STATE OF TEXAS
VS.
LAURO EDUARDO RUIZ
IN THE TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS AUSTIN, TEXAS
ORDER
On this day came to be heard Ruiz' Motion to Allow Filing of Reply Brief
It is the opinion of this Court that the Motion should be:
GRANTED/DENIED.
So ordered on this theday of, 2018.
PRESIDING JUDGE